



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,882	06/03/2004	Hayato Ariyoshi	SIMTEK6905	3881

25776 7590 08/25/2006

ERNEST A. BEUTLER, ATTORNEY AT LAW  
10 RUE MARSEILLE  
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

EXAMINER

LE, DANG D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/709,882  
Filing Date: June 03, 2004  
Appellant(s): ARIYOSHI ET AL.

**MAILED**

**AUG 25 2006**

**GROUP 2800**

**MAILED**

**AUG 25 2006**

**GROUP 2800**

Kabushiki Kaisha Morie  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed June 6, 2006 appealing from the Office  
action mailed January 20, 2006.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

5,900,687

Kondo et al.

5-1999

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kondo et al. (5,900,687).**

Regarding claim 10, Kondo et al. shows a terminal structure (Figure 2) for interconnecting coil ends in a plural phase rotary electrical machine and adapted to be mounted at one axial end of a core (top, Figure 1) having a plurality of circumferentially spaced pole teeth (1) around which electrical coils (2) are wound, said terminal structure comprising a plurality of interconnected (at 3b, shown in Figure 6) conductors (3) equal in number to at least the number of phases (3 phases) and bonded (column 4, lines 25-35) in spaced relationship to each other, the interconnected conductors of each of said phase interconnected each having at least two circumferentially spaced terminal end portions (3b, Figure 2) for receiving a coil wire end from a respective one of said coil windings (Figures 5-7).

Regarding claim 11, it is noted that Kondo et al. also shows the phases being axially spaced from each other (Figure 4).

Regarding claim 12, it is noted that Kondo et al. also shows the each phase-specific terminal member being made of plural connecting pieces comprised of arcs of concentric circles (Figure 2).

Regarding claim 13, it is noted that Kondo et al. also shows the interconnected conductors of each of the phases all lying in a common axial plane (Figure 6 and admitted by the applicant in paper dated 11/06/05).

**(10) Response to Argument**

The examiner would respectfully like to point out that Kondo et al. shows more than one way to connect the coil windings (2) having coil ends in a three-phase stator. Kondo et al. utilizes the end plate (7) as a supporting member with grooves (7a) to support the electrical conductors identified as 3a, 4a, and 5a with the ends 3b, 4b, and 5b, respectively. Figures 5 and 6 show one embodiment where the caulking member 9 extending radially and lying in a common axial plane defined by the surface of the end plate 7. In contrast, Figure 7 shows another embodiment where the caulking member 9 extending axially. In other words, Kondo et al. shows two locations of the connection between the coil ends and the terminal end portions as long as "the connected portions do not extend beyond the outer diameter of the stator" column 4, lines 24-25. Also please see column 4, lines 14-23 for detailed explanation of Figures 5-7.

The examiner agrees that Figures 5-7 do not show any axial spacing as recited in claim 11. However, Figure 4 shows the axial spacing because the electrical conductors 3a, 4a, and 5a are stacked one on top of another in the groove of the end plate 8, which is different from the end plate 7. Please see column 4, lines 10-13.

With the use of the end plate 8 shown in Figure 4 and the connection shown in Figure 6, Kondo et al. clearly indicates the interconnected conductors of each of the phases all lie in a common axial plane defined by the ends of the stator coil (2) and the

Art Unit: 2834

ends 3b, 4b, and 5b of the electrical conductors 3a, 4a, and 5a. This is possible because the electrical conductors 3a, 4a, and 5a, respectively have the ends 3b, 4b, and 5b, which could have the same length or different length and could be bent easily.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.


Respectfully submitted,



DANG LE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Dang Dinh Le

Conferees:

Darren Schuberg 

Drew Dunn 